



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXVIII, 2.

WHOLE NO. 150.

I.—RHETORICAL ELEMENTS IN LIVY'S DIRECT SPEECHES.

PART I.

Some knowledge of rhetorical ornamentation is essential for any adequate appreciation of Livy's speeches.¹ A historian

¹Weissenborn-Müller (ed. 1885), I, 68: "die Glanzpunkte der Geschichte des Livius"; 69: "die Reden . . . die schönsten Früchte der rhetorischen Studien des Livius"; Kohl, Ueber Zweck und Bedeutung der Livianischen Reden, Barmen, 1872, p. 13: "Livius beabsichtigt hat, mit den Reden die äusere Darstellung auszuschnücken und sein Buch zu einem schönen, Genuss gewährenden Kunstwerk zu erheben"; p. 23: "Die vorzüglichste Quelle der Erkenntnis bieten die Reden zur Beurtheilung seiner schriftstellerischen Befähigung, namentlich seiner rhetorischen Tüchtigkeit"; Soltau, Livius Geschichtswerk, Leipzig, 1897, p. 16: "Hier bemüht er sich seine eigene rhetorische Kunstfertigkeit zu zeigen"; Moczyński, De Titi Livi . . . propria elocutione, Progr. Deutsch-Krone, 1901, p. 5: "contiones, quae in Livii opera exstant, quasi lumina sermonis"; cf. pp. 21-25, where rhetorical figures are treated, but most inadequately. See also Friedersdorff, De orationum operi Liviano insertarum origine et natura, Tilsit, 1886, pp. 3-10; Petzke, Dicendi genus Tacitinum quatenus differat a Liviano, Diss. 1888, pp. 49-80; Nissen, Kritische Untersuchungen, p. 25 f.; Kühnast, Die Hauptpunkte der liv. Syntax, Berlin, 1872, pp. 273-331; Haupt, Anleit. zum Verständnis der liv. Darstellungsform, Leipzig, 1892, pp. 35-74; Queck, Die Darstellung des Livius, Progr. Sondershausen, 1853, pp. 12-22. Recognition of the rhetorical element in Livy's work has long since advanced beyond Ulrici's statement (Charakteristik der antiken Historiographie, Berlin, 1833, p. 318): "Livius Schönheit der Darstellung haben viele mit Entzücken bewundert und gepriesen; allein noch niemand hat es gewagt, seine Geschichte als

who, on his own testimony (9, 17, 1), did not accord first place to literary adornment, Livy nevertheless shares in no small degree a thorough knowledge of the *τέχνη ῥητορικὴ* possessed by ancient historians. An attempt has been made elsewhere¹ to show in a general way that by training, sympathy, and literary composition Livy reveals close kinship with the ancient orator. In the present instance there will be brought together and discussed certain conspicuous elements of a rhetorical character²—sententiae and the more important figures of speech—employed by him in direct speeches. These will next be examined to learn what conclusions as to usage may be drawn, both for the separate elements and for their sum total, and for the speeches and speakers individually and collectively; and finally, they will be studied in regard to their availability as a chronological test of Livy's style.

The total number of direct speeches inserted by Livy is large.³ Of these sixty-seven have been examined for this study, nineteen (35 Teubner pages) from the first decade, twenty (43 pp.) from the third, seventeen (38 pp.) from the fourth, and eleven (25 pp.) from the fifth. In general, selection has been confined to speeches—usually the longer ones—which show distinct evidence of effort, speeches in which Livy's rhetorical and psychological art is seen at its best, and in which we may assume he attained most fully his oratorical purpose. For economy in reference it will be convenient at this point to describe the speeches briefly as to setting, and to indicate their place of citation: the speech of Valerius Publicola exhorting tribunes and people in rebellion (3, 17); Capitolinus urging the people to war against Aequians and Volscians (3, 67-68);

Kunstwerk aufzustellen und auszuweisen". See Taine, *Essai sur Tite-Live* (ed. 1910), p. 189 ff., and for a study of Livy's mastery over individual elements of narration, K. Witte, *Rh. M.*, LXV, pp. 270-305; 359-419.

¹ *Class. Jour.*, IX, 24-34.

² These both in variety and number exceed the estimate of Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa*, I, p. 236 f.

³ In the extant thirty-five books there are four hundred and seven, excluding numerous colloquia (Kohl, *op. cit.*, p. 2). The number in the entire work is estimated by Soltau (*Neue Jahrb. f. d. kl. Alt.*, IX, p. 23) at not fewer than two thousand.

Canuleius advocating legal intermarriage between patricians and plebeians (4, 3-5); Appius Claudius opposing the withdrawal of troops from Veii (5, 3-6); Camillus dissuading from removal to Veii (5, 51-54); M. Manlius exhorting the plebeians to vengeance on the patricians (6, 18); Appius Claudius Crassus refuting the sponsors for the Licinio-Sextian laws (6, 40-41); Sextus Tullius, centurion, protesting against Sulpicius the dictator (7, 13); ambassadors from Capua to the Roman senate (7, 30); Decius the tribune to his soldiers (7, 35); M. Valerius Corvus, dictator, to soldiers in revolt (7, 40); Setinus urging amalgamation of Latins and Romans (8, 4); Setinus and T. Manlius to the Roman senate (8, 5); Pontius the Samnite to his soldiers (9, 1); L. Lentulus exhorting the consuls to accept Pontius' terms of surrender (9, 4); Postumius to the senate on the peace of Caudium (9, 8-9); Pontius to Postumius (9, 11); Sempronius the tribune inveighing against Appius Claudius the censor (9, 34); Decius Mus persuading acceptance of the Lex Ogulnia (10, 7-8); Hanno to the senate at Carthage (21, 10); Alorcus urging the Saguntines to accept Hannibal's terms (21, 13); Scipio to his soldiers at the Ticinus (21, 40-41); Hannibal to his soldiers (21, 43-44); Minucius, master of horse, arraigning the policy of Fabius (22, 14); Fabius urging caution on L. Aemilius Paulus (22, 39); a soldier from Cannae pleading for his fellow-prisoners before the senate (22, 59); Torquatus opposing the ransom of prisoners of Cannae (22, 60); Terentius Varro to ambassadors from Capua (23, 5); Calavius the Capuan dissuading his son from slaying Hannibal (23, 9); an ambassador from the remnants of Cannae pleading for service with Marcellus (25, 6); L. Marcius haranguing the soldiers of the late Scipios (25, 38); Vibius Virrius counseling the Campanians not to surrender to Rome (26, 13); Publius Scipio to his soldiers (26, 41); Marcellus to his soldiers after their defeat by Hannibal (27, 13); Scipio rebuking his army for a revolt during his illness (28, 27-29); an embassy from Saguntum thanking the Romans for their services (28, 39); Q. Fabius opposing Scipio's plan for carrying the war into Africa (28, 40-42); Scipio's reply (28, 43-44); an embassy from Locris complaining against Pleminius and his soldiers (29, 17-18); Sophonisba, wife of Syphax, pleading with Masinissa (30, 12); Scipio

rebuking Masinissa (30, 14); Hannibal discussing peace with Scipio prior to the battle of Zama (30, 30); Scipio's reply (30, 31); a Macedonian to the Roman embassy in the Aetolian assembly (31, 29); Aristaenus advising Achaean chiefs to accept Rome's alliance against Philip (32, 21); M. Porcius Cato against the repeal of the Lex Oppia (34, 2-4); L. Valerius for its repeal (34, 5-7); Hannibal counseling Antiochus as to war against Rome (36, 7); Acilius Glabrio to his soldiers (36, 17); Eumenes pleading his claim for possessions taken from Antiochus (37, 53); the Rhodians presenting their claims (37, 54); Cn. Manlius to his soldiers (38, 17); Purpureo and L. Aemilius Paulus opposing a triumph for Cn. Manlius (38, 45-46); Manlius' reply (38, 47-49); a consul on Bacchanalian rites at Rome (39, 15-16); Lycortas the Lacedaemonian answering Rome's ambassador (39, 36-37); Philip before the privy council addressing his sons (40, 8); Perseus to Philip (40, 9-11); Demetrius to Philip (40, 12-15); Callicrates to the Achaeans on their treaty with Rome (41, 23); Archo to the Achaeans (41, 24); Eumenes warning the Romans against Perseus (42, 13); Perseus to the Roman embassy (42, 41-42); L. Aemilius Paulus to the people (44, 22); Paulus to his council (44, 38-39); Astymedes in behalf of the Rhodians (45, 22-24); Servilius in behalf of Paulus' triumph (45, 37-39).

Of the three kinds of oratory (*genera causarum*) generally recognized by the ancients,¹ *iudiciale*, *demonstrativum*, *deliberativum*, nearly all of Livy's speeches belong to the last mentioned. They are political and legislative in character, *suasiones* or *dissuasiones*, which most readily serve the purposes of the historian. This kind of speech has for its aim *utilitas*,² which plays a part in practically every speech in Livy.³ The

¹ Arist. *Rhet.*, I, 3, 3; Ad *Her.*, I, 2, 2; Cic. *de Invent.*, I, 5, 7; Quint., III, 3, 14; Volkmann, *Rhet. der Griechen und Römer*, Leipzig, 1885, pp. 19-24.

² Cic. *de part. or.*, 24, 83: "est igitur in deliberando finis utilitas, ad quem ita referuntur omnia in consilio dando sententiae dicenda, ut illa prima sint suasori aut dissuasori videnda, quid aut possit fieri aut non possit et quid aut necesse sit aut non necesse"; Volkmann (*op. cit.*, p. 20): "Ziel und Zweck ist für den beratenden Redner das Nützliche und Schädliche".

³ See Kohl, *op. cit.*, p. 24 f., for an analysis of several speeches (32, 21; 36, 17; 38, 17; 21, 40-41; 5, 3-6; 5, 51-54) which show clear corre-

genus demonstrativum, having to do with matters of praise or blame not under judicial investigation, is represented only by the speech of the Saguntine embassy (28, 39), and by that of L. Aemilius Paulus (45, 41), which latter shows close relationship with the oratio funebris.¹ Under the genus iudiciale,² most important in the history of Roman eloquence, may with certainty be placed only the two speeches of Philip's sons before the father (40, 9-15), each accusatory and defensive in substance. The accusation against Pleminius (39, 16-22) is, however, quasi-judicial, since the senate in this instance (as frequently) appointed a commission to conduct his trial.³

spondence with this principle, and with the divisions found in Seneca's *Suasoriae*.

¹ Cucheval, *Histoire de l'éloquence latine* (3 ed.), I, p. 111 f.

² Historians prior to Livy employ most often the deliberativum, rarely the demonstrativum. The three classes together are introduced first by Livy (Friedersdorff, *op. cit.*, p. 7). That he avoided the iudiciale, notwithstanding frequent opportunity for its use, is clear. In the trial of Appius Claudius (3, 56-58) both accusation and defense are almost entirely in oratio obliqua. Camillus, without delivering a speech of accusation or defense, goes into exile, we are told (5, 32). Scipio Africanus before the tribal assembly in judicial character (38, 50-52), at the first hearing briefly recites his services; at the second he invites the people to join him in giving thanks to the gods; prior to the third he withdraws from Rome. The avoidance is further observable in numerous cases where plaintiff and defendant use few words, or where we are told in another connection the substance of what they are supposed to have said at the trial. Explanation for this is doubtless to be found, in the cases of Camillus and Scipio, in the recognized incompatibility of representing men of such distinguished services as pleading their cause before the people; in other cases, in a realization that the innovation should be used with caution, or in the wish to observe a proper ratio between indirect and direct speeches.

³ The senate by the appointing of quaestiones extraordinariae began early (414 B. C., according to Livy, 4, 50, 6 ff.) to encroach upon the judicial function of the assembly in criminal cases (see Botsford, *Roman Assemblies*, pp. 253-257). But we have no record of a criminal case in which the senate actually exercised judicial powers. Nor could it delegate judicial competence, this being derived from the recognized right of the magistrate who presided over the court so appointed (cf. Abbott, *Class. Jour.*, II, 125).

SENTENTIAE.

Definitions with illustrations are abundant.¹ They are reckoned among figures of speech by some writers,² rejected by others.³ However classed, their employment constitutes an artistic device no less important than the use of figures. The latter, though serving primarily to enhance the force, clearness or charm of expression, aim to affect the *πάθος* of the hearer or reader, while the proper use of *sententiae* has a twofold result, according to Aristotle. The hearer is always pleased with the expression, in the form of a general truth, of any view which he previously, if only partially, entertained,⁴ and the use of *γνώμαι* lends character to a speech,⁵ since they reveal the sentiment of the speaker. If the *γνώμαι* have a good moral tendency, they stamp the speaker as a man of sound conviction. These striking moral statements, of so general an application that they may ordinarily be separated from their context without losing their force, are most effective when short and epigrammatic. The rhetorical advantage won by their use lies in the fact that life and distinction of thought may be gained by the reverse of detailed form, by "the art of putting things", as it were.

The greater number of *sententiae* used by Livy are those of simple statement, a kind commended by the author of *Ad*

¹ Arist. Rhet., II, 21, 2: ἔστι δὲ γνώμη ἀπόφανσις, οὐ μέντοι περὶ τῶν καθ' ἑκάστων . . . ἀλλὰ καθόλου· καὶ οὐ περὶ πάντων καθόλου, οἷον ὅτι τὸ εὐθὺ τῷ καμπύλῳ ἐναντίον, ἀλλὰ περὶ ὅσων αἱ πράξεις εἰσὶ, καὶ αἰρετὰ ἢ φευκτὰ ἔστι πρὸς τὸ πράττειν. *Ad Her.*, IV, 17, 24: "sententia est oratio sumpta de vita, quae aut quid sit aut quid esse oporteat in vita, breviter ostendit"; Quint., VIII, 5, 3 (see §§ 1-32): "est autem haec vox universalis, quae etiam citra complexum causae possit esse laudabilis". These definitions differ only in comprehensiveness, that of Aristotle being most complete. For an excellent discussion of *sententia*, its connotations and employment, see Holmberg, *Studien zur Terminologie und Technik*, Upsala, 1913, pp. 8-12; 121-123.

² *Ad Her.*, IV, 8, 11.

³ Quint., IX, 3, 98; Volkman, *op. cit.*, p. 452.

⁴ II, 21, 15.

⁵ II, 21, 16: ἡθικοὺς γὰρ ποιεῖ τοὺς λόγους. To a lesser degree the speaker uses *sententiae* as an appeal to the *ἡθος* of his hearers (Volkman, l. c.).

Her.,¹ and by Quintilian,² as in Livy 3, 68, 10 *natura hoc ita comparatum est, ut qui apud multitudinem sua causa loquitur, gravior eo sit, cuius mens nihil praeter publicum commodum videt*; 5, 4, 4 *labor voluptasque dissimillima natura, societate quadam inter se naturali sunt iuncta*; 21, 44, 3 *maior spes, maior est animus inferentis vim quam arcentis*; 21, 44, 9; 28, 44, 8; 30, 30, 11 *non temere incerta casuum reputat, quem fortuna numquam decepit*; 30, 30, 18 *maximae cuique fortunae minime credendum est*; 30, 30, 19 *melior tutiorque est certa pax quam sperata victoria*; 30, 30, 20 *numquam minus quam in bello eventus respondent*; 30, 30, 21 *simul parta ac sperata decora unius horae fortuna evertere potest*; 30, 30, 24 *est quidem eius qui dat, non qui petit, condiciones dicere pacis*; 31, 29, 15; 32, 21, 7; 34, 3, 5; 34, 4, 13; 34, 4, 19; 37, 54, 16; 42, 22, 7; 45, 23, 8. Some of Livy's examples are double statements,³ as in 9, 1, 10 *iustum est bellum . . . quibus necessarium, et pia arma, quibus nulla nisi in armis relinquitur spes*; 22, 39, 19 *veritatem laborare nimis saepe aiunt, extinguere numquam: vanam gloriam qui spreverit, veram habebit*; 22, 39, 22; 28, 42, 2; 34, 4, 8; 38, 17, 13; 38, 49, 5; 45, 23, 14. In 28, 44, 2 we have a sententia triple in predication: *multum interest, alienos populari fines an tuos uri et excindi videas; plus animi est inferenti periculum quam propulsanti; ad hoc maior ignotarum rerum est terror*. By far the larger number of examples are introduced by asyndeton (hence the more striking), a conjunction being found only four times: *sed* 25, 38, 18; 28, 27, 11; 30, 30, 7; *sicut* 34, 4, 8. A sententia strengthened by a conjunction adding a reason is technically known as an enthymeme.⁴ I find two instances: 25, 38, 14 *ad id, quod ne*

¹ IV, 17, 24: "*huius modi sententiae simplices non sunt inprobandae, propter quod habet brevis expositio, si rationis nullius indiget, magnam delectationem*".

² VIII, 5, 4: "*esse eam aliquando simplicem, ut ea, quae supra dixi*".

³ Cf. Quint., loc. cit.; Ad Her., loc. cit.

⁴ Arist. Rhet., II, 21, 2: *προσθεθείσης δὲ τῆς αἰτίας καὶ τοῦ διὰ τί, ἐνθύμημά ἐστι τὸ ἅπαν*. Cf. Anon. Rhet. Gr., I, 321, 26 (Sp.); Quint., V, 10, 1: "*nam enthymema . . . sententionem cum ratione*" [significat]; Victor. RLM (H.), 412, 34: "*sed enthymema gnomicon hoc a sententia differt, quod ibi tantum simpliciter sententia pronuntiatur, hic autem simul et ratio sententiae redditur*". The sententiale enthy-

timeatur fortuna facit, minime tuti sunt homines, quia, quod neglexeris, incautum atque apertum habeas; 25, 38, 18 sed in rebus asperis et tenui spe fortissima quaeque consilia tutissima sunt, quia, si in occasionis momento, cuius praetervolat opportunitas, cunctatus paulum fueris, nequiquam mox omissam quaeras. In no case is a *sententia* employed by Livy to introduce a speech (*προμύθιον*) or to conclude one (*ἐπιφώνημα*), usages (particularly the latter) which with ancient writers carried especial weight,¹ and which are often observed by modern writers or speakers. A *sententia* may refer to persons or things,² or to persons and things combined.³ To persons, eight times: 3, 68, 10; 25, 38, 14; 28, 27, 11 sed multitudo omnis sicut natura maris per se immobilis est; 30, 14, 7 qui eas [voluptates] temperantia sua frenavit ac domuit, multo maius decus maioremque victoriam sibi peperit; 30, 30, 11; 30, 30, 24; 34, 4, 19; 45, 23, 14. To things, much oftener, as 5, 4, 4; 6, 18, 7; 9, 1, 10; 21, 44, 3; 21, 44, 9; 22, 39, 22 omnia non properanti clara certaue erunt; festinatio inprovida est et caeca; 25, 38, 18; 28, 42, 7 non semper temeritas est felix, et fraus fidem in parvis sibi praestruit, ut, cum operae pretium sit, cum mercede magna fallat; 30, 30, 7, 18, 19, 20, 21; 31, 29, 15; 32, 21, 7; 34, 3, 5; 34, 4, 8, 13, 19; 37, 54, 16; 38, 17, 13; 38, 49, 5. To persons and things: see 22, 39, 19; 28, 44, 2 quoted above. Finally, one may detect in

mema is, however, not distinguished from *sententia* by Isid. RLM., 512, 4, or by Cassiod. RLM., 499, 22. See also Holmberg, op. cit., p. 53 ff.

¹ Anon. Rhet. Gr., III, 116, 17; Rufin. RLM., 45, 24. More frequently *ἐπιφώνημα* is applied to a striking reflexion used by way of concluding attestation to any involved narration or proof; cf. Quint., VIII, 5, 11 (who cites Verg. Aen., I, 33: "tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem"); Victor. RLM., 437, 35; Volkmann, op. cit., 455; Holmberg, op. cit., 124. In this sense Livy has sundry examples, as 6, 41, 11 "tanta dulcedo est ex alienis fortunis praedandi", etc.; 26, 13, 13: "tanta aviditas supplicii expetendi, tanta sanguinis nostri hauriendi est sitis"; 26, 13, 19: "haec una via et honesta et libera ad mortem".

² Quint., VIII, 5, 3: "interim ad rem tantum relata . . . interim ad personam".

³ According to Aristotle (l. c.) a universal principle is concerned only with human actions. But the moral character of the *gnome* makes it applicable to every act and object of human interest (see Cope-Sandys' note). Hence a third class of examples.

Livy's speeches proverbs,¹ or proverbial allusions, now quoted almost unchanged, now in greatly modified form, as 7, 13, 7 cur . . . compressis, quod aiunt, manibus sedeas? 9, 4, 16 et pareatur necessitati, quam ne dii quidem superant; 9, 4, 10 equidem mortem pro patria praeclaram esse fateor; 9, 9, 11; 10, 8, 10 en umquam fando audistis patricos primo esse factos non de caelo demissos; 22, 14, 9; 22, 39, 10 nec eventus modo hoc docet—stultorum iste magister est; 28, 40, 3 scio . . . rem actam hodierno die agi.

Livy's low total of forty-four occurrences, considering the number and length of the speeches from which they are taken, shows a constraint² well in keeping with his preference for unobtrusive ornamentation. Probably no writer in all antiquity of equal popularity and influence has contributed fewer expressions of universal application. Looking at the individual speeches it will be seen that sententiae are used most freely by Hannibal: to Scipio (seven), to his soldiers (two); by Cato (five); Q. Fabius Maximus (four); L. Marcius (two). In this distribution we have an adaptation to the character of each speaker, the use of maxims being appropriate in men of known self-control, of distinction, personal or official, of advancement in years and experience, and of real wisdom withal in the subject discussed.³ This adjustment to character explains why

¹ Not as numerous as Otto (Sprichwörter, Einleit., p. XXXVI) indicates: "Livius macht öfter von ihnen Gebrauch"; cf. Arist., II, 21, 12: *ἔτι ἔναι τῶν παροιμιῶν καὶ γινώμαί εἰσιν*. Quint., V, 11, 21; Holmberg, op. cit., p. 173.

² Aristotle gives no precept as to desirable frequency. The writer of Ad Her. (I. c.) counsels a conservative use: "sententias interponi raro convenit"; so Quint., VIII, 5, 8: "in hoc genere custodiendum est et id, quod ubique, ne crebrae sint . . . et ne passim et a quocumque dicantur". Cf. also Quint., VIII, 5, 25-30, where a middle course is recommended between those who set the highest value on sententiae and those who reject them entirely. Livy's usage is in harmony not only with rhetorical precept, but also with the practice of classical authors (Moczyński, p. 7; Volkmann, p. 453). Cicero's relatively limited employment is dictated by the character of the oration rather than by rhetorical dogma (Holmberg, p. 198). Through influence of the Asian style (cf. Cic. Brutus, 95, 325) sententiae became frequent in Roman usage, and so much the vogue that many considered them the chief source of ornamentation.

³ Arist. (I. c.): *ἀρμόττει δὲ γνωμολογεῖν ἡλικία μὲν πρεσβυτέροις, περὶ δὲ τούτων ὧν ἔμπειρός τις ἐστίν*. Cf. Quint., VIII, 5, 8.

none are used by Canuleius, Appius Claudius, or P. Sempronius; none by Scipio to his soldiers, Scipio mature but not so celebrated as his antagonist Hannibal, whose speech closely follows; none by the younger Scipio, or the Locrian ambassadors. So may be explained the absence of a single example in the long speeches of Perseus and Demetrius before king Philip, the interest in whose family drama held Livy's admiration so far beyond other episodes as almost to make him forget his duty as a historian.

RHETORICAL FIGURES.

In this paper it will not be necessary to insist on the exact classification of, or shades of resemblance and difference between, figures and tropes. The distinction, frequently pronounced,¹ is again difficult to maintain.² As a practical rule a trope will here be regarded as the use of a particular word in deviation from its normal sense, a figure as an affair of whole clauses or sentences.³ The usual division of rhetorical figures, from Theophrastus on,⁴ is *σχῆμα τῆς διανοίας* (*figurae mentis* vel *sententiarum*) and *σχήματα τῆς λέξεως ἢ τοῦ λόγου* (*figurae elocutionis* vel *verborum*⁵). By Quintilian⁶ a further division of *figurae verborum* is made into rhetorical and grammatical, while Fortunatianus⁷ asks and answers: *genera figurarum quot sunt?* tria: *λέξεως, λόγου, διανοίας*. In the following pages a figure of thought will be regarded as having its basis not in any special combination of words, but in an assumed attitude of the speaker's mind,⁸ while a figure of expression will be considered a combination of words for the artificial expression of an idea.

¹ Quint., IX, 1, 3-7.

² Quint., IX, 1, 9; Volkmann, p. 456.

³ Cf. Jebb, *Attic Orators*, II, p. 60; *Alex. Rhet. Gr.*, III, 11; Quint., IX, 1, 4-14.

⁴ Quint., IX, 1, 17; *Aq. Rom. RLM.*, 23, 5; *Donat. Gr. Lat.*, IV, 397, 5 (K.). See also Volkmann, p. 460.

⁵ The difference is given by Tib. *Rhet. Gr.*, III, 69: *τούτῳ δὴ μάλιστα φαίη τις ἂν αὐτὰ διενηροχέναι, τῷ τὰ μὲν τῆς διανοίας σχήματα, κὰν ὑπαλάξῃ τις αὐτὰ τοῖς ῥήμασιν, ὁμοίως μένειν, τὰ δὲ τῆς λέξεως σχήματα οὐχ οἶόν τε εἶναι φυλάττεσθαι ὑπαλλαττομένης τῆς λέξεως*. See also *Aq. Rom. RLM.*, 28, 31.

⁶ IX, 3, 2.

⁷ *RLM.*, 126, 24.

⁸ Jebb, (1. c.).

FIGURES OF THOUGHT.

INTERROGATION.

It is designated as *ἐρώτημα* (interrogatio, interrogatum) and *πύσμα* (quaesitum, percunctatio). The former is used of the sentence question or the question expecting an answer yes or no; the latter expects, if any answer at all, an extended one.¹ The rhetorical question is the most frequent of the figures of thought, and one of the most effective. Its purpose is to embarrass an opponent by virtually asserting the reverse of what is asked. The emphasis of the figure consists in its character as a challenge to gainsay the statement, explicitly or implicitly negative, conveyed by the speaker. Since much depends upon how the question is put, the orator's concern is to formulate the question so skilfully that the answer corresponds to the view which he wishes to assert, and, at the same time, to quicken interest and harmony between himself and audience. Livy's usage is free and varied. Notable in number and effectiveness are the instances (one hundred and six) in which several interrogations follow in immediate succession,² e. g. ten in the speech of Demetrius, nine in that of M. Servilius, six in that of Aristaenus; six examples each in 23, 9, 6; 28, 43, 10; 34, 6, 16; 45, 23, 2; five in 4, 3, 6; 4, 3, 9; 6, 40, 17; 26, 13, 4; 28, 28, 14; 38, 45, 9; four in 3, 17, 2; 4, 4, 4; 5, 52, 3; 5, 52, 14; 8, 4, 2; 8, 5, 8; 9, 34, 12; 28, 42, 17; 34, 5, 8; 40, 9, 11; 41, 24, 17; 44, 38, 10; 45, 39, 13. The larger number of questions (one hundred fifty-three), referring to some special circumstance about which the orator would speak, are accompanied by interrogative pronoun or adverb; in about one-fourth, however, where the question betrays abruptness, disgust, excitability, vehemence, blame, indignation, etc., no such interrogative word

¹ Theon, Rhet. Gr., II, 97, 26: διαφέρει δὲ τοῦ πύσματος ἡ ἐρώτησις, ὅτι πρὸς μὲν τὴν ἐρώτησιν συγκαταθέσθαι δεῖ μόνον ἢ ἀρνήσασθαι, οἷον . . . , ἢ διὰ γε τοῦ ναὶ ἢ οὐ ἀποκρίνασθαι, τὸ δὲ πύσμα μακροτέραν ἀπαιτεῖ τὴν ἀπόκρισιν. Alex. Rhet. Gr., III, 24, 31; Aq. Rom. RLM., 25, 26. The author of Schem. Dian. RLM., 75, 27 reverses the meanings, while Quint. (IX, 2, 6) says: "quid tam commune quam interrogare vel percontari? nam utroque utimur indifferenter, quamquam alterum noscendi, alterum arguendi gratia videtur adhiberi".

² Called *ἐπιτροχασμός* by Donat. (on Ter. Ad., 670). This term, however, is applied to any congeries or coacervatio by Aq. Rom. RLM., 24, 16.

is found; e. g. in 22, 60, 26 the speaker in reply to the proposal to ransom the prisoners of Cannae asks: *et vos redimamus?* So Calavius (23, 9, 6): *unus adgressurus es Hannibalem?* Camillus (5, 52, 3): *hos omnes deos publicos privatosque, Quirites, deserturi estis?* In many cases (some forty), where the interrogative word is wanting (frequently so if the question contains non), it is uncertain whether the sentence is a question, an exclamation or an ironical statement, e. g. 4, 3, 13 *paeniteat nunc vos plebei consulis, cum maiores nostri advenas reges non fastidierint, et ne regibus quidem exactis clausa urbs fuerit peregrinae virtuti?* 22, 60, 16 *pretio redituri estis eo unde ignavia ac nequitia abistis?* 38, 46, 12 *vultis ergo haec omnia pollui et confundi, tolli fetialia iura, nullos esse fetiales?* Frequently *quid?* indicates a rhetorical rise: 22, 14, 12; 26, 13, 4; 28, 41, 12; 38, 49, 2; 39, 37, 11; 40, 13, 3. Or, *quid?* may introduce a question that serves merely as a transition: 3, 68, 3; 4, 4, 1; 6, 40, 12; 28, 28, 11; 34, 6, 7; 40, 9, 13; 45, 23, 7. Where strong impatience on the speaker's part is evident (twenty examples) *tandem* is added for emphasis to interrogative pronouns or adverbs, as in 3, 68, 3 *quid tandem?* *privatae res vestrae quo statu sunt?* So the less emphatic *-nam*, as 6, 40, 18 *quaenam ista societas, quaenam consortio est?* 39, 36, 12 *quonam modo, etc.?* 45, 39, 5.

A considerable number of Livy's sentence questions (yes or no type) are rhetorical, especially those accompanied by *non*, *nonne*, *ne* . . . *quidem*, and *num*. In those with *non* strong affirmation of the positive is made by reason of the hearer's irresistible denial of the speaker's negative question, as 4, 4, 5 *hoc ipsum, ne conubium patribus cum plebe esset, non decemviri tulerunt . . . cum summa iniuria plebis?* 5, 6, 3; 9, 11, 8; 10, 7, 10; 41, 23, 9. In the question with *nonne* the speaker asks negatively about a negative predication, hence affirms with spirit, as 5, 52, 13 *nonne in mentem venit quantum piaculi committatur?* 34, 5, 8. So where *ne* . . . *quidem*=*nonne*, 4, 3, 9; 28, 42, 17. With *num* the speaker compels a negative by asking the hearer whether he will stamp as valid a predication absurd or impossible, as in 5, 5, 8 *periculi quod differendo bello adimus, num oblivisci nos haec tam crebra Etruriae concilia de mittendis Veios auxiliis patiuntur?* 5, 51, 7; 5, 52, 6; 38, 46, 12. Double or alternative questions are used rhetor-

ically to assert a negative opinion as to the truth of one or more of the propositions, as in 4, 5, 1 *regibus exactis utrum vobis dominatio an omnibus aequa libertas parta est?* 5, 3, 7; 21, 10, 6; 21, 41, 5; 22, 14, 12; 28, 28, 15 *utrum exercitus exercitui, an duces ducibus, an dignitas, an causa comparari poterat?* 28, 43, 12 is notable for the number of alternatives used. Of rhetorical interest also is Livy's frequent use (some thirty examples) of *an* in the second part of a question (where there is no first part, or where it is suppressed) to mark surprise, indignation, remonstrance, irony, etc., e. g. four times in the speech of Appius Claudius (5, 3, 4; 5, 4, 7; 5, 6, 7; 5, 6, 11), thrice in that of Canuleius (4, 4, 5; 4, 5, 2; 4, 5, 3).

As to moods used in Livy's rhetorical questions, the indicative greatly exceeds the subjunctive.¹ A preponderance of five to one is easy of explanation. The speeches are used freely to characterize the speakers, and the indicative reveals the speaker's plan, ideal, motive, etc., while the subjunctive represents a concession to the will or conviction of persons addressed. The mood of the question is the mood of the expected answer.² Thus, rhetorical questions in the indicative, anticipating an indicative answer in the negative (or its logical equivalent, a positive, if in answer to a negative question), imply a negative opinion on the speaker's part,³ as 3, 67, 10 *qui finis erit discordiarum?* *ecquando unam urbem habere, ecquando communem hanc esse patriam licebit?* 21, 43, 12; 32, 21, 5. In the subjunctive used rhetorically the speaker anticipates a potential answer in the negative⁴ (or its logical equivalent), e. g. in 9, 34, 12 *quem tu regem sacrificiorum crees?* 22, 60, 14; 23, 5, 13; 28, 41, 5. Included here is the so-called deliberative subjunctive,⁵ used chiefly in questions of the first person (as

¹ The proportion noted is about 250 to 50. The actual number of questions in both moods is much larger, since only the first of a series is counted here.

² Gildersleeve-Lodge, *Lat. Gr.*, p. 295.

³ In the double question, of course, the negative answer (or its equivalent) of the hearer and the negative opinion of the speaker apply to the alternative, not to both propositions.

⁴ Gildersleeve-Lodge, p. 296.

⁵ Under this head Bennett (*Syntax of Early Latin*, I, p. 178 ff.) discusses four types which are seldom differentiated. True deliberatives,

if to conform to the will of the person addressed), and anticipating either an answer in the imperative, or no answer at all. For this usage Bennett (loc. cit.) reserves the name "Subjunctive of Duty or Fitness". Note these instances in Livy: 6, 18, 8 *quid sperem, si plus in me audeant inimici?* an exitum Cassi Maeliique expectem? 7, 13, 7; 25, 5, 5; 28, 43, 18.

Properly considered here also is the figure of the answer,¹ by which the questioner, led along to an advanced step, gives artful emphasis, now by magnifying, now by extenuating, to what has gone before. I have noted about one hundred examples in Livy. In most cases the answer serves simply to reinforce the idea conveyed by the question without answering it directly, as in 3, 67, 11 *satisne est nobis vos metuendos esse?* adversus nos Aventinum capitur, adversus nos Sacer occupatur mons; 5, 6, 4 *ut . . . non aestus, non frigora pati possint?* erubescant profecto, si quis eis haec obiciat; 7, 30, 22; 28, 42, 7; 34, 5, 8; 38, 46, 4; 45, 23, 3. Again, a question is answered by asking another, 3, 67, 4 *quem tandem ignavissimi hostium contempsero?* nos consules an vos, Quirites? 28, 43, 10-12; 42, 41, 11-12. Frequently the speaker, without pausing for a reply, substitutes his own answer succinctly, either to a question represented as put to himself² or asked of another.³ Illustra-

known as the figure of dubitatio, *διαπόρῃσις*, *ἀπορία* (see Quint., IX, 2, 19; Ad Her., IV, 29, 40; Volkmann, p. 496), of which I find no examples in Livy, are a very small class.

¹ It is variously designated and defined, e. g. Ad Her., IV, 23, 33: 'subiectio est, cum interrogamus adversarios aut quaerimus ipsi, quid ab illis aut quid contra nos dici possit, dein subicimus id, quod oportet dici aut non oportet aut nobis adiumento futurum sit aut offuturum sit contrario'; Tib. Rhet. Gr., III, 77, 5: *ὑποφορά δέ ἐστιν ὅταν μὴ ἐξῆς προβαίῃ ὁ λόγος, ἀλλ' ὑποθεῖς τι ἢ ὡς παρὰ τοῦ ἀντιδίκου ἢ ὡς ἐκ τοῦ πράγματος ἀποκρίνηται πρὸς αὐτόν*. Cf. Quint., IX, 2, 12. Union of question and answer is also known as *διαλογισμός* or *διαλεκτικόν* (see Tib. Rhet. Gr., III, 67; Rufin. RLM., 43, 22; Char. Gr. Lat., I, p. 283 K.). For the visualizing effect of question and answer in Demosthenes, see Longinus, *Περὶ Ὑψους*, XVIII, 1.

² Quint., IX, 2, 14: "ceterum et interrogandi se ipsum et respondendi sibi solent esse non ingratae vices".

³ Quint., IX, 2, 15: "cui diversum est, cum alium rogaveris, non expectare responsum, sed statim subicere: [Cic. Orat., 67, 223] 'Domus tibi deerat? at habebas' . . . quod schema quidam per suggestionem vocant".

tions of the former are: 9, 34, 14 quid ego antiqua repetam? nuper intra decem annos C. Maenius dictator . . . dictatura se abdicavit; 22, 59, 18; of the latter: 5, 54, 2 adeo nihil tenet solum patriae nec haec terra, quam matrem appellamus, sed in superficie tignisque caritas nobis patriae pendet? equidem—fatebor vobis . . . —cum abessem, quotienscumque patria in mentem veniret, etc.; 6, 18, 11; 9, 4, 14. Again, the answer is made to come from hearer or opponent as an objection, ὑποφορά, to a question raised by the speaker, e. g. 4, 3, 17 f. an . . . potiusque decemviris . . . quam optimis regum novis hominibus similis consules sumus habituri? at enim nemo post reges exactos de plebe consul fuit; 5, 52, 5; 5, 53, 1; 6, 40, 9; 6, 40, 18; 9, 4, 12 quid habent, quod morte sua servant? tecta urbis, dicat aliquis, et moenia et eam turbam, a qua urbs incolitur; 34, 3, 9; 34, 5, 11; 34, 7, 10; 42, 41, 12 quiescerem et paterer, donec Pellam et in regiam meam armatus pervenisset? at enim . . . sed vinci non oportuit eum, neque alia quae victis accidunt pati; 45, 37, 9. Finally, the answer is used to convey irony, as 9, 4, 13 quis enim ea tuebitur? inbellis videlicet atque inermis multitudo; 28, 41, 3 f.; 32, 21, 28; 41, 23, 9. At times this ironical answer is itself in the form of a question, e. g. 3, 68, 4 quid est tandem domi, unde ea expleatis? tribuni vobis amissa reddent ac restituent?

Sundry rhetorical aims of the question as used by Livy are suggested above. Note further that it is used quite in harmony with the character of the speaker and the end which the speech has in view. It occurs most frequently when the speaker is impulsive and passion rises high, as in the speech of Appius Claudius (fourteen examples); Camillus (eighteen); Appius Claudius Crassus (fifteen); P. Cornelius Scipio, 28, 27–29 (eleven); Cato (nine); Perseus (eight); Demetrius (thirteen). For the opposite reasons it is used but twice each by Scipio and Hannibal in their solemn speeches prior to the death struggle in Italy; three times in the earnest plea for ransom of the prisoners of Cannae, but eight times in the spirited protest of Torquatus against the proposition; not at all by Q. Fabius urging the cunctandi ratio, or by Hannibal or Scipio, discussing with mutual deference and admiration the question of peace prior to the battle of Zama.

IRONY.

Irony is reckoned both as a trope¹ and as a figure.² By irony language in its literal acceptation is the exact opposite of what the speaker says, there being something in the tone, the character of the speaker, the nature of the subject or the attendant circumstances to show the speaker's real drift. Its force consists in its being so unanswerable as to leave no doubt of the falsity of what it assumes as true. It may censure with praise and insult with a compliment, or it may praise under pretense of censure.³ Of the latter use, Livy has one example, 34, 7, 14, where L. Valerius says of the women: *id enim periculum est, ne Sacrum montem, sicut quondam irata plebs, aut Aventinum capiant*. Of the former, examples are frequent, as 4, 5, 3 *scilicet, quia nobis consultum volebatis, certamine abstinuistis*; 5, 4, 12 *scilicet quia levis causa belli est, nec satis quicquam iusti doloris est, quod nos ad perseverandum stimulet*; 5, 5, 4; 9, 4, 13; 32, 21, 28; 40, 14, 5 *ipse quoque minime malus ac suspicax*. Still more frequently the speaker apparently endorses an absurd act, policy or condition, and so sets forth a contrast between the real character of persons and what is said of them or their acts, as in 9, 11, 11 *ita dii credent Samnitum civem Postumium, non civem Romanum esse, et a Samnite legatum Romanum violatum: eo vobis iustum in nos factum esse bellum*; 28, 40, 13 *videlicet ut mihi iam vivendo, non solum rebus gerendis fesso, si huic negata fuerit, Africa provincia decernatur*; 31, 29, 8; 32, 21, 31; 34, 7, 11

¹ Quint., VIII, 6, 54 regards irony as a second species of allegory (called *illusio* § 44 and defined: "*aut aliud verbis, aliud sensu ostendit, aut etiam interim contrarium*") : "*in eo vero genere, quo contraria ostenduntur ironia est*". Allegory in this wide sense (including irony), called *permutatio* by Ad Her., IV, 34, 46, is likewise defined: "*oratio aliud verbis aliud sententia demonstrans*". Cf. Tryphon, Rhet. Gr., III, 205; Char. Gr. Lat., I, 276, 4 f. (K.).

² Quint., IX, 1, 3: "*ut cum ironia tam inter figuras sententiae quam inter tropos reperitur*"; Aq. Rom. RLM., 24, 21; Rufin. RLM., 61, 36 f. As a figure irony differs from its use as a trope by its greater length, by its greater concealment of the real sense and by the fact that as a figure it may exist without any trope, i. e. in a kind of *ἀντιφάσις* or *omissio*; cf. Quint., IX, 2, 44 f.; Rufin. RLM., 62, 16.

³ Quint., VIII, 6, 55: "*et laudis adsimulatione detrahare et vituperationis laudare concessum est*"; Isidor. RLM., 521, 25.

scilicet, si legem Oppiam abrogarit, non vestri arbitrii erit, si quid eius vetare volueritis, quod nunc lex vetat; minus filiae, uxores, sorores etiam quibusdam in manu erunt; 40, 9, 1; 42, 41, 3; 42, 42, 2 scilicet ut, quod nunc vos facere queror, urbes occuparem, arcibus imponerem praesidia; 45, 23, 19 id enimvero periculum erat, ne Romanos Rhodii contemnerent.

As a subdivision of irony Quintilian¹ notes *σαρκασμός*, of which Livy has two excellent examples: one used by Appius Claudius Crassus (of whom Livy says, *dicatur odio magis iraque quam spe ad dissuadendum processisse*), 6, 41, 9–10 *volgo ergo pontifices augures sacrificuli reges creentur, cuilibet apicem dialem, dummodo homo sit, inponamus, tradamus ancilia penetralia deos deorumque curam quibus nefas est; non leges auspicato ferantur, non magistratus creentur . . .* Sextius et Licinius tamquam Romulus ac Tatius in urbe Romana regnent, quia pecunias alienas, quia agros dono dant; the other by the opponents of Cn. Manlius, who ask indignantly, 38, 46, 12 *vultis ergo haec omnia pollui et confundi, tolli fetialia iura, nullos esse fetiales? oblivio deorum capiat pectora vestra; num senatum quoque de bello consuli non placet? non ad populum ferri, velint iubeantne cum Gallis bellum geri?* Closely akin also to irony is the figure *παράλειψις* (occultatio, omissio, praeteritio) by which, under professed silence, one yet calls emphatic attention to a thing,² as Livy 5, 5, 6; 5, 52, 7; 26, 13, 8 *alterum annum circumvallatos inclusosque nos fame macerant, et ipsi nobiscum ultima pericula et gravissimos labores perpassi, circa vallum ac fossas saepe trucidati ac prope ad extremum castris exuti. sed omitto haec.* Here and there irony, introducing an objection or exception with *nisi, nisi forte*, etc., takes the form of a *reductio ad absurdum*, as in 3, 68, 10 *nisi forte adsentatores publicos, plebicolos istos, qui vos nec in armis nec in otio esse sinunt, vestra vos causa incitare et stimulare putatis;* 5, 3, 7; 21, 40, 7; 22, 59, 10; 22, 60, 21; 28, 41, 4; 40, 12, 17; 41, 23, 9. Finally, to the forty examples of interrogation which

¹ VIII, 6, 57. The distinction sometimes made between irony and sarcasm (exacerbatio, Rufin. RLM., 62, 15), that the meaning of the one is obscure, of the other clearly apparent, is neglected here, where sarcasm is understood in its proper sense of biting irony, *plena odio atque hostilis irrisio* (Beda, RLM., 616, 23).

² Tib. Rhet. Gr., III, 60: *παράλειψις δέ ἐστιν ὅταν τῷ δοκεῖν τινα παραλείπειν λέγει ἃ βούλεται.* Aq. Rom. RLM., 24, 25; Capella, RLM., 478, 3.

may be construed with irony (see p. 136) should be added the following: 4, 3, 7 *si populo Romano liberum suffragium datur . . . stare urbs haec non poterit? de imperio actum est? et perinde hoc valet "plebeius ne consul fiat", tamquam servum aut libertinum aliquis consulem futurum dicat?* 4, 3, 10; 4, 3, 16; 4, 4, 11 *cur non sancitis, ne vicinus patricio sit plebeius, nec eodem itinere eat, ne idem convivium ineat, ne in foro eodem consistat?* 4, 5, 3; 5, 52, 4; 6, 18, 9; 9, 34, 6; 9, 34, 8; 9, 34, 11; 26, 13, 4 *iam e memoria excessit, quo tempore et in qua fortuna a populo Romano defecerimus?*

From Livy's usage as reviewed above it will be apparent that the sharp weapon of irony is employed most freely by those best fitted to use it, by Canuleius (six times), Appius Claudius, Appius Claudius Crassus, and P. Sempronius (thrice), by Q. Fabius Maximus, Demetrius, and Perseus (twice).

CLIMAX.

Climax consists in the arrangement of the words of a series, parts of a sentence, or entire sentences so that the least impressive stand first, while successive parts gradually increase in emphasis, interest, or enlargement of meaning.¹ The force of the figure lies in its recognition of the law that thought to be effective must be progressive. Augmentation may be attained by one step or by several.² Livy's usage shows only the step-by-step class, and no attempt is made to reach such effect of climax as e. g. in Verg.³ or in Milton.⁴ The figure is used by Livy in such moderation as to preserve everywhere his simple,

¹ In this sense the term is *αὐξησις* (Anon. Rhet. Gr., I, 457, 5; Vict. RLM., 169, 23), or *incrementum* (Quint., VIII, 4, 3-9). Climax with this meaning is treated as a division of *amplificatio* by Ad Her., II, 30, 47 f. In the sense usually understood by the ancients, elevation with repetition of the same word, the term is *κλιμαξ* (Alex. Rhet. Gr., III, 31, 10; Anon. Rhet. Gr., III, 183, 26), *gradatio* (Ad Her., IV, 25, 34; Isid. RLM., 517, 24), or *gradatus* (Rufin. RLM., 52, 29). Such artificial climaxes are rare, and it is not surprising that Livy has no example.

² Quint. (l. c.).

³ Aen., VII, 649: "quo pulchrior alter Non fuit excepto Laurentis corpore Turni".

⁴ P. L., IV, 76 f.: "And, in the lowest deep, a lower deep
Still threatening to devour me opens wide."

unaffected style, the quality of which an excessive employment would tend to destroy. Of single words in climactic arrangement may be cited 8, 4, 11 *audiente non populo Romano modo senatuque sed Iove ipso, qui Capitolium incolit*; 9, 9, 5 *vos, tribuni, diceretis et hanc urbem, templa, delubra, fines, aquas Samnitium esse?* 21, 41, 7; 26, 13, 13 *Roma circumsessa, coniuges, liberi . . . arae, foci, deum delubra, sepulcra maiorum, etc.*; 34, 7, 8. More frequently phrases are so arranged: 3, 17, 4 *tantum hostium non solum intra muros, sed in arce, supra forum curiamque*; 5, 5, 7; 5, 5, 11; 7, 13, 10 *cum vincere cupimus, tum te duce vincere, tibi lauream insignem deferre, tecum triumphantes urbem inire, tuum sequentes currum Iovis optimi maximi templum gratantes ovantesque adire*; 7, 40, 6; 21, 41, 5; 21, 43, 14; 21, 43, 15 *me in praetorio patris . . . prope natum, certe eductum, domitorem Hispaniae Galliaeque, victorem eundem non Alpinarum modo gentium sed ipsarum, quod multo maius est, Alpium*. So clauses: 3, 17, 5; 3, 67, 5 *quippe totiens fusi fugatique, castris exuti, agro multati, sub iugum missi*; 3, 68, 6; 7, 13, 4 *sicubi loco cessum, si terga data hosti, si signa foede amissa*; 7, 40, 6; 9, 1, 9; 21, 10, 12; 25, 6, 18 *non solum a patria procul Italiaque sed ab hoste etiam relegati sumus, ubi senescamus in exilio, ne qua spes, ne qua occasio abolendae ignominiae, ne qua placandae civium irae, ne qua denique bene moriendi sit*; 26, 13, 15; 28, 28, 9; 29, 17, 15; 29, 18, 14; 36, 7, 16; 36, 17, 14. Sentences arranged in climax are: 3, 68, 7 *ante portas est bellum: si inde non pellitur, iam intra moenia erit, et arcem et Capitolium scandet, et in domos vestras vos persequetur*; 3, 68, 13; 4, 3, 8; 4, 3, 10 f.; 4, 5, 2; 4, 5, 6; 5, 4, 13; 7, 30, 19 *vobis arabitur ager Campanus, vobis Capua urbs frequentabitur; conditorum, parentium, deorum immortalium numero nobis eritis*; 32, 21, 23; 45, 24, 12 *omnia libera capita, quidquid Rhodiorum virorum feminarum est, cum omni pecunia nostra naves conscendemus, ac relictis penatibus publicis privatisque Romam veniemus, et omni auro et argento, quidquid publici quidquid privati est, in comitio, in vestibulo curiae vestrae cumulado, corpora nostra coniugumque ac liberorum vestrae potestati permittemus, hic passuri quodcumque patiendum erit*.

In many of the speeches no instance of climax is found. Nearly one-half of the total thirty-nine are assigned to five speeches, that of Capitolinus (four), Canuleius (four), Appius

Claudius (four), Scipio at the Ticinus (three), Locrian embassy (three). Anticlimax (*ἀντίκλιμαξ* a maioribus ad minora) was not recognized by ancient writers on rhetoric. Of this figure I find no certain example used with intentional (comic) effect, a result quite in keeping with Livy's sober style. However in Scipio's address to his soldiers (21, 40, 9), full of exaggerations about Hannibal and his men, we have: effigies immo, umbrae hominum, fame frigore inluvie squalore enecti, contusi ac debilitati inter saxa rupesque; ad hoc praeusti artus, nive rigentes nervi, membra torrida gelu.

APOSTROPHE AND EXCLAMATION.

These figures are united under the term exclamatio by the author of *Ad Her.*¹ Apostrophe, originally used of turning away from the address to the judges,² means by extension any turning from the natural course of thought, to address persons or things vividly as if present. It is employed by Livy but rarely,³ always, of course, in indication of high excitement, as in 3, 17, 6 Romule pater, tu mentem tuam, qua quondam arcem ab his isdem Sabinis auro captam recepisti, da stirpi tuae. iube hanc ingredi viam, quam tu dux, quam tuus ingressus exercitus est. primus en ego consul, quantum mortalis deum possum, te ac tua vestigia sequar; 5, 52, 7 quid [loquar] de ancilibus vestris, Mars Gradive tuque Quirine pater? haec omnia in profano deseri placet sacra aequalia urbi, quaedam vetustiora origine urbis? 5, 52, 14; 8, 5, 8 audi, Iuppiter, haec scelera, inquit; audite Ius Fasque: peregrinos consules et peregrinum senatum in tuo, Iuppiter, augurato templo captus ipse atque oppressus visurus es? 9, 8, 8 vos, dii immortales, precor quae-soque, si vobis non fuit cordi . . . consules cum Samnitibus prospere bellum gerere, at vos satis habeatis vidisse nos sub iugum missos, etc. In the figure of exclamation⁴ (exclamatio,

¹ IV, 15, 22.

² Tib. Rhet. Gr., III, 61, 28; Quint., IX, 2, 38. The term *aversio* is also used (Quint. § 39; Aq. Rom. RLM., 25, 3).

³ Cf. *Ad Her.* (I. c.): "hac exclamazione si loco utemur, raro, et cum rei magnitudo postulare videbitur, ad quam volumus indignationem animi auditoris adducemus".

⁴ By some numbered among figures of expression; see Quint., IX, 2, 26 f.; also IX, 3, 97 (against Cic. de Orat., III, 54, 207): "posita inter figuras verborum exclamatio, quam sententiae potius puto".

ἐπεκφώνησις), the thought strongly felt, or feigned as felt, is indicative of grief, indignation, pleasure, fear, wonder, etc., as in 3, 67, 1, where emotion is heightened by the use of the exclamatory infinitive¹: hoc vos scire, hoc posteris memoriae traditum iri, Aequos et Volscos, vix Hernicis modo pares, T. Quinctio quartum consule ad moenia urbis Romae inpune armatos venisse! See also 5, 51, 6; 5, 52, 10 Iuno regina transvecta a Veis nuper in Aventino quam insigni ob excellens matronarum studium celebrique dedicata est die! 22, 39, 16 quam diu pro Gereoni, castelli Apuliae inopis, tamquam pro Carthaginis moenibus sedet! 26, 41, 10 quot classes, quot duces, quot exercitus priore bello amissi sunt! 28, 29, 6 vos ne dici quidem omnia aequo animo fertis! . . . utinam tam facile vos obliviscamini eorum, quam ego obliviscar! 28, 44, 4; 29, 17, 5; 44, 39, 6. In 28, 42, 2 emotional emphasis is further indicated by confirmatory (asseverative) ne²: ne tibi, P. Corneli, cum ex alto Africam conspexeris, ludus et iocus fuisse Hispaniae tuae videbuntur!

Of the same general character, but less effective, are numerous interjectional words or phrases introducing sentences used in an exclamatory way, pro deum fidem, 3, 67, 7; 44, 38, 10; me dius fidius, 5, 6, 1; 22, 59, 17; 34, 5, 13; hercule(s), 5, 4, 10; 5, 5, 12; 5, 6, 12; 6, 40, 15; 28, 44, 12; 29, 18, 12; 34, 3, 3; 34, 7, 5; 38, 46, 6; 40, 10, 8; 42, 41, 7; 44, 39, 1; mehercule, 38, 17, 18; en, 3, 17, 6; 4, 3, 10; 8, 4, 6; 10, 8, 10; 28, 27, 9; ecce, 7, 35, 10. In six of these instances the exclamation is accompanied by interrogation, an evidence of the close original relation of question and exclamation, 3, 67, 7 pro deum fidem quid vobis vultis? 4, 3, 10; 5, 54, 6; 10, 8, 10; 42, 41, 7; 44, 38, 10.

Included here, as a species of exclamation, are sundry examples of *προσωποποιία*,³ e. g. the introduction of the words of an abstraction personified,⁴ as in 5, 4, 7 an, si ad calculos eum res publica vocet, non merito dicat, "annua aera habes", etc. So, the words of absent persons, e. g. of the Roman people

¹ Cf. Anderson, *Class. Phil.*, IX, 61, 62, 74.

² Anderson, *op. cit.*, 184, 188.

³ Cf. Quint., VI, 1, 25: "prosopopoeiae, id est fictae alienarum personarum orationes"; Anon. *Rhet. Gr.*, III, 212, 13.

⁴ Cf. Cic. *Phil.*, XIII, 3, 6: "sin responderit [sapientia]: 'tuere ita vitam corpusque'", etc.; Cat., I, 7, 18: [patria] "loquitur 'nullum iam aliquot annis facinus exstitit'", etc.

(crudelissima ac superbissima gens), 21, 44, 6 "ne transieris Hiberum! ne quid rei tibi sit cum Saguntinis! nusquam te vestigio moveris!"; of Cato, quoting what he had felt inclined to say, 34, 2, 9 "qui hic mos est in publicum procurrendi et obsidendi vias et viros alienos appellandi?" etc.; of the women, explaining their motive for asking the repeal of the Oppian law, 34, 3, 9 "ut auro et purpura fulgamus", etc.; of the rich matron, opposing equalization in dress, 34, 4, 14 "hanc . . . ipsam exaequationem non fero . . . cur non insignis auro et purpura conspicior? cur paupertas aliarum sub hac legis specie latet, ut, quod habere non possunt, habiturae, si liceret, fuisse videantur?" Of an objector, 5, 52, 5 forsitan aliquis dicat aut Veis ea nos facturos, aut huc inde missuros sacerdotes, qui faciant; 6, 40, 8 f.; 9, 4, 12; 21, 10, 11 dedemus ergo Hannibalem? dicet aliquis; 21, 40, 8 "at enim pauci quidem sunt, sed vigentes animis corporibusque, quorum robora ac vires vix sustinere vis ulla possit"; 37, 53, 25 quid ergo postulas? dicat aliquis; of an opponent, as by Purpureo and L. Aemilius Paulus thwarting the ambition of Cn. Manlius for a triumph, 38, 47, 8 "non erant Galli hostes, sed tu eos pacatos imperata facientes violasti".

That Livy follows rhetorical precept in the matter of apostrophe and exclamation, using it rarely and only in cases of real emotion, is apparent—thirty-nine of the speeches offering not an instance. Further, that his employment of the figures marks the character of the speaker is shown by the number of examples in certain speeches, in that of Appius Claudius, five, Camillus, six, Cato, five, L. Aemilius Paulus, three, and two each in the speeches of Capitolinus, Appius Claudius Crassus, Scipio, L. Valerius, and P. Valerius.

ANTITHESIS.

Antithesis (*ἀντίθετον*,¹ *ἀντίθεσις*,² contentio,³ contrapositum⁴) is the juxtaposition of opposite parts for the purpose of enhanc-

¹ Anax. *Τέχνη Ῥητορική*, chap. 26: ἀντίθετον μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ τὸ ἐναντίαν τὴν ὀνομασίαν ἅμα καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τοῖς ἀντικειμένοις ἔχον ἢ τὸ ἕτερον τούτων. Hermog. *Rhet. Gr.*, II, 439.

² Rufin. *RLM.*, 47, 16: σύγκρισις sive ἀντίθεσις, "comparatio rerum atque personarum inter se contrariarum".

³ Ad Her., IV, 45, 58: "contentio est, per quam contraria referuntur".

⁴ Quint., IX, 3, 81.

ing their effect by contrast. Antithesis in its broader significance may extend beyond mere verbal oppositions.¹ Here can be noted only a few details of antithesis, and these apart from its frequency in the figures of chiasmus and anaphora, to be treated below. Writers distinguish antitheses in words, thoughts, and words and thoughts combined. Hence antithesis may be regarded both as a figure of expression, and of thought. But one need consider practically only those examples in which there is an antithesis both in words and thought, in which kind the artistic purpose of the speaker is most apparent. There are few instances in Livy's speeches in which antithesis occurs between single words, as 3, 17, 6 *ego consul, quantum mortalis deum possum, te . . . sequar*; 6, 41, 1 *quo modo extorqueant, non quo modo petant honores quaerunt, et ita maxima sunt adepturi, ut nihil ne pro minimis quidem debeant; et occasionebus potius quam virtute petere honores malunt*; 26, 41, 13 *et hae secundae res illas adversas sustinuerunt*. Far more usual is the contrast between two or more pairs of words or clauses, 3, 67, 5 *non illi vestram ignaviam contempsere, nec suae virtuti confisi sunt*; 3, 67, 6 *dum nec nobis imperii nec vobis libertatis est modus, dum taedet vos patriciorum, hos plebeiorum magistratum*; 3, 67, 10; 3, 68, 5, 12; 4, 3, 13, 17; 4, 5, 1, 2, 6; 5, 3, 7; 5, 51, 2, 5; 5, 52, 4 *an gentilia sacra ne in bello quidem intermitteri, publica sacra . . . etiam in pace deseri placet? et pontifices flaminesque neglegentiores publicarum religionum esse quam privatus in sollemni gentis fuerit?* 5, 53, 4, 5, 6; 5, 53, 7 *velitisne illos Romanos, vos Veientes esse; an malitis hanc solitudinem vestram quam urbem hostium esse?* 5, 54, 3 *quae vos, Quirites, nunc moveant potius caritate sua, ut maneatis in sede vestra, quam postea, cum reliqueritis, ea macerent desiderio*; 5, 54, 6; 6, 18, 6, 10, 11; 6, 40, 9; 6, 40, 14 *sed omnia semper, quae magistratus ille dicet, secundis auribus, quae ab nostrum quo dicentur adversis accipietis?* 6, 40, 18 *ut duos plebeios fieri consules liceat, duos patricos non liceat, et alterum ex plebe creari*

¹ Nägelsbach (*Lat. Stil.*, p. 634) recognizes in the expression of contrasted clauses "die den Organismus des lateinischen Satzes beherrschende Macht".

necesse sit, utrumque ex patribus praeterire liceat? 6, 41, 2, 6; 7, 13, 9; 7, 30, 12, 13; 7, 35, 11; 8, 4, 10; 9, 4, 14, 16; 9, 8, 3; 9, 11, 9 ut quidem tu quod petisti per pactionem habeas, tot cives incolumes, ego pacem, quam hos tibi remittendo pactus sum, non habeam; 21, 13, 2; 21, 13, 5; 21, 40, 11; 22, 39, 4; 22, 39, 6 ille consul demum et in provincia et ad exercitum coepit furere; hic, priusquam peteret consulatum, deinde in petendo consulatu, nunc quoque consul, priusquam castra videat aut hostem, insanit. In 22, 39, 11-14 we have a series of clauses in nearly every one of which the words are in sharp contrast with the words of the corresponding clauses; so in 22, 39, 20 two series of three members in contrast, malo te sapiens hostis metuat quam stulti cives laudent. omnia audentem contemnet Hannibal, nihil temere agentem metuet. Other illustrations of antithesis in Fabius' speech are found §§ 18, 19, 21. The same in the speech of Torquatus, 22, 60, 8, 16, 25, 26. See also 23, 9, 4 Hannibalem pater filio meo potui placare, filium Hannibali non possum? 25, 38, 12; 26, 41, 6 non ut ipsi maneamus in Hispania, sed ne Poeni maneant, nec ut pro ripa Hiberi stantes arceamus transitu hostes, sed ut ultro transeamus transferamusque bellum; 26, 41, 9; 28, 41, 9 pax ante in Italia quam bellum in Africa sit, et nobis prius decedat timor quam ultro aliis inferatur. Notable are 30, 30, 8, a contrast in four series of four members each, and 30, 31, 7, where Scipio contrasts in seven particulars the conditions of peace, had Hannibal voluntarily left Italy, with those possible after he has been drawn perforce into Africa: ceterum, quem ad modum superbe et violenter me faterer facere, si, priusquam in Africam traiecissem, te tua voluntate cedentem Italia et inposito in naves exercitu ipsum venientem ad pacem petendam aspernarer, sic nunc, cum prope manu consertum resitantem ac tergiversantem in Africam adtraxerim, nulla sum tibi verecundia obstrictus; 36, 17, 4 f., in which, as an encouragement to his soldiers, the Roman consul contrasts as opponents Philip and his army with the aimless Antiochus and his motley forces; 37, 53, 6, where King Eumenes weighs his own claims for recognition by Rome against those of the Rhodians. Still other illustrations, 31, 29, 5; 34, 5, 12; 34, 7, 3, 5, 13; 38, 47, 6 triumphavit, quem non bellum iniustum gessisse, sed hostem

omnino non vidisse inimici iactabant; ego, qui cum centum milibus ferocissimorum hostium signis collatis totiens pugnavi . . . non triumpho modo fraudor, sed causam apud vos, patres conscripti, accusantibus meis ipse legatis dico; 39, 16, 4; 40, 15, 13; 40, 15, 16; 42, 13, 11 hoc quam vobis tutum aut honestum sit, vos videritis: ego certe mihi turpe esse duxi prius Persea ad bellum inferendum, quam me socium ad praedicendum, ut caveretis, venire in Italiam.

Antithesis is used very effectively by Livy when a series of independent sentences are in opposition, six e. g. in 3, 67, 7 f. tribunos plebis concupistis: concordiae causa concessimus. decemviros desiderastis: creari passi sumus. decemvirorum vos pertaesum est: coegimus abire; 9, 11, 6 obsides Porsinnae dedistis: furto eos subduxistis; auro civitatem a Gallis redemistis: inter accipiendum aurum caesi sunt; pacem nobiscum pepigistis . . .: eam pacem inritam facitis; see also 4, 3, 15; 5, 4, 11; 5, 6, 3; 5, 53, 3 f., 9; 6, 18, 7, 8; 6, 41, 8; 7, 35, 4; 7, 40, 12; 28, 42, 20 ille consul profectus in Hispaniam, ut Hannibali ab Alpibus descendenti occurreret, in Italiam ex provincia rediit: tu cum Hannibal in Italia sit relinquere Italiam paras, non quia rei publicae id utile, sed quia tibi amplum et gloriosum censes esse.

Livy's judicious use of these figures is additional evidence of his avoidance of artifice and affectation. In every instance there is real opposition of thought, whether contrasted parts have the same structure or not. Never is Livy so concerned with the how as to forget the what of his discourse. Of the one hundred examples noted seven are employed by Q. Fabius Maximus, six by Manlius, the distinguished patrician, defender of the capitol, four by T. Manlius Torquatus, three by Hannibal to Scipio, two by Scipio to Hannibal, the usage in each case reflecting the age and experience of the speaker, the moralizing character of the speech, as well as its comparative freedom from strong passion. This conclusion is supported by the fact that Camillus, in a speech three times as long as that of Fabius Maximus, and under great excitement, uses but ten examples; further by the fact that Capitolinus and Canuleius use seven each, Appius Claudius, six, and L. Valerius, four.

HYPERBOLE.

Hyperbole (*ὑπερβολή*,¹ superlatio,² exaggeratio,³ decens veri superiectio⁴), usually classed as a trope, is here under the broad definition laid down on p. 134 treated as a figure.⁵ Its force lies in the fact that the hearer feeling the excess as due to emotion shares something of the speaker's emotion. Livy has naturally no examples of hyperbole arising from a contemplation of the sublime, or from the effort to exaggerate a fancy. To lend vividness or impressiveness a real state is enhanced or diminished, the former being the more common. Frequently other figures are combined, e. g. 4, 3, 6 quid tandem est cur caelum ac terras misceant? 4, 4, 4 quis dubitat quin in aeternum urbe condita, etc.? 21, 40, 9 effigies immo, umbrae hominum, fame frigore inlue squalore enecti; see also 5, 4, 12 nos intra vicensimum lapidem in conspectu prope urbis nostrae; 6, 41, 3 omitto Licinium Sextiumque, quorum annos in perpetua potestate tamquam regum in Capitolio numeratis; 21, 40, 10 reliquias extremas hostis, non hostem habetis; ac nihil magis vereor, quam ne, cum vos pugnaveritis, Alpes vicisse Hannibalem videantur; 21, 41, 7 Hannibal . . . vectigalis stipendiarisque et servus populi Romani a patre relictus; 21, 43, 18 cum [militibus] laudatis a me miliens donatisque; 22, 14, 5 sed Poenus advena, ab extremis orbis terrarum terminis; 23, 5, 11 Poenus hostis, ne Africae quidem indigena, ab ultimis terrarum oris; 25, 6, 21 ad Syracusas terra marique geritur res; clamorem pugnantium crepitumque armorum exaudimus; 26, 13, 13

¹ Tryphon, Rhet. Gr., III, 198, 30: *ὑπερβολή ἐστὶ φράσις ὑπεραίρουσα τὴν ἀλήθειαν αὐξήσεως ἢ μειώσεως χάριν.*

² Ad Her., IV, 33: "superlatio est oratio veritatem alicuius augendi minuendive causa"; cf. Cic. de Orat., III, 203: "augendi minuendive causa veritatis supralatio atque traiectio".

³ Gell., XIII, 25, 9.

⁴ Quint., VIII, 6, 67.

⁵ Cf. Rufin. RLM., 47, 27: "*ὑπερβολή* aliis tropus videtur: ceterum fit, cum excedit veritatem, sententia". That exaggeration may extend beyond a trope is clear from such an example as Livy, 23, 5, 11 f., Poenus hostis . . . expertem omnis iuris et condicionis et linguae prope humanae militem trahit. hunc natura et moribus inmitem ferumque insuper dux ipse efferavit pontibus ac molibus ex humanorum corporum strue faciendis et, quod proloqui etiam piget, vesci corporibus humanis docendo.

Roma circumsessa, coniuges, liberi, quorum ploratus hinc prope exaudiebantur; 30, 30, 8 et nos ab Carthagine fremitum castrorum Romanorum exaudimus.

This examination of Livy's usage has shown that the figure occurs but rarely and only where the imagination and feelings of the speaker's audience are sufficiently aroused to admit it.¹

H. V. CANTER.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

¹ Cf. Quint., VIII, 6, 76: "tum est hyperbole virtus, cum res ipsa, de qua loquendum est, naturalem modum excessit". So Longinus (op. cit., XXXVIII, 3) teaches that hyperbole is best, when, through stress of strong emotion, the very fact that hyperbole is used escapes attention.